

Application No.: 10/820,950
Atty. Dkt.: ZK522/03054

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-21 remain pending in the present application. Claims 6, 7, 11, 12 and 19 have been amended.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-6 and 12-21 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chinniah et al. (US 2003/0235046). Applicant submits that Chinniah et al. fails to disclose the LED light spreader as currently claimed. Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of those claims.

Regarding Claims 1, 12, and 17, Examiner alleges that Chinniah et al. discloses an LED light spreader having a series of partial cylindrical lengths and partial frustoconical lengths forming an elongated member having a rounded surface and a light emitting surface.

Chinniah et al. discloses:

The body 34 includes a top surface 36, a bottom surface 38, a front surface 40 and *at least two side surfaces* 42 and 44. The top and bottom surfaces 36, 38 of the body 34 are more readily seen in FIG. 2.

As further seen in FIG. 1, when viewed in a direction towards the top surface 36, the body 34 is provided with a generally *pie wedge shape* with the front surface 40 being opposed from the point or apex 46 of the pie wedge shape. From FIG. 1 it is also seen that the pie wedge shape is equilateral in its construction. Chinniah et al., para. 33, ln. 4 - para. 34 ln. 6.

The structure disclosed in Chinniah et al. is best shown in Figs. 5 and 6 where a plurality of the light spreaders are arranged to form a disk shaped light emitter. It is clearly shown that light spreader has pie wedge shape with flat side surfaces.

The LED light spreader as currently claimed does not have flat side surfaces, as shown in the FIGs. in Chinniah et al. but instead has a series of partial cylindrical lengths interposed with partial frustoconical lengths, or has a series of sections having a first length of a constant arc

Application No.: 10/820,950

Atty. Dkt.: ZK522/03054

radius and a second length of linearly decreasing arc radius which is not disclosed in Chinniah et al. The curved surface shown in FIG. 11 of Chinniah et al. does not have a linear decreasing arc radius about the light emitting side nor does it form a partial cylindrical length or a partial frustoconical length as currently claimed in Claims 1, 12, and 17. Since Chinniah et al. does not disclose the claim limitations as set forth above, Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 2 and 20, they depend from Claims 1 and 17 respectively and have the claim limitations as set forth above through claim dependency. Since Claims 1 and 17 are not anticipated as shown above, Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn as well.

Regarding Claims 3, 16, and 21, there is no coating shown in FIGs. 1 or 2 as Examiner has alleged. Nor is such a reflective coating disclosed in the specification of Chinniah et al. Therefore, Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 4, 5, and 19, they depend from Claims 1 and 17 respectively and have the claim limitations as set forth above through claim dependency. Since Claims 1 and 17 are not anticipated as shown above, Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Regarding Claim 6, Chinniah et al. discloses a convex or outwardly curved area, not an inwardly curved surface as currently claimed. Therefore, Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding Claims 13, 14, 15, and 19, Claims 13 – 15 depend from Claim 12 while Claim 19 depends from Claim 17 and hence have the claim limitations as set forth above through claim

Application No.: 10/820,950

Atty. Dkt.: ZK522/03054

dependency. Since Claims 12 and 17 are not anticipated by Chinniah et al., Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shimura et al. (U.S. Patent 6,712,492). Applicant submits that Shimura et al. fails to disclose the LED light spreader as currently claimed. Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of those claims.

Regarding Claims 7-10, Claim 7 is currently amended to incorporate an optical path conversion side being substantially rounded about a longitudinal axis of the elongated LED light spreader. Chinniah et al. does not disclose the LED light spreader as currently claimed in Claim 7. Claims 8-10 depend from Claim 7 and hence have the claim limitations of Claim 7 through claim dependency. Therefore, Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimura et al. (U.S. Patent 6,712,492) in view of Chinniah et al. (US 2003/0235046). Claim 11 depends from Claim 7 and hence has the claim limitations of Claim 7 through claim dependency. The structure of the LED light spreader claimed in Claim 7 is not disclosed, as previously show. Nor is the currently claimed LED light spreader taught in either cited reference or the combination of references, hence, Applicants' Attorney respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/820,950
Atty. Dkt.: ZK522/03054

Conclusion

Applicants' Attorney asserts that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Applicants' Attorney therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner allow the pending claims. However, if the Examiner believes there are other unresolved issues in this case, Applicants' Attorney of record would appreciate a call at (502) 584-1135.

Respectfully submitted,

MIDDLETON REUTLINGER



Steve A. Witters, Esq., Reg. No. 53,923
2500 Brown & Williamson Tower
Louisville, KY 40202
(502) 584-1135 phone
(502) 561-0442 fax
switters@middreut.com